



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/645,868	08/24/2000	Phillip Orrin Wheeler	8371-112	4031
20575	7590	09/23/2004	EXAMINER	
MARGER JOHNSON & MCCOLLOM PC 1030 SW MORRISON STREET PORTLAND, OR 97205			TRAN, DOUGLAS Q	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2624	
DATE MAILED: 09/23/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/645,868	WHEELER, PHILLIP ORRIN
Examiner	Art Unit	
Douglas Q. Tran	2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2004.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-4 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 13 May 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings were received on 5/13/04. The figure 1 of drawings is modified with the attaching of “Prior art”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbons et al. (US Patent No. 5,305,020) and Parsons et al. (US Patent No. 5,133,048).

As to claim 1, Gibbons teaches a method of updating an indicator 134 (fig. 3A) of a printer, comprising:

scanning a representative piece of paper creating a scanned image of paper stock to be placed in a print tray of the printer (fig. 3B and col. 6, lines 10-15 indicates that the interchangeable tray 126 is loaded and hold media of type and size; and col. 6, lines 27-32, and 49-53 describes that the status information of the paper stock of the paper of the tray “i.e.,126”, such as the type/size information are sensed by sensors 132, 134 and 136, it is noted that the scanner would be considered as a sensor for sensing the paper stock and generating the sensed signal “or scanned image” of the paper stock to the controller 46);

accessing a document management application to locate and including the scanned image in the application; and associating the scanned image with the print tray of the printer using the document management application (the printer "fig. 1" inherently comprises a program component corresponding to a document management application for controlling the scanning/sensing of the paper stock of the located trays and displaying the viewing features on the indicator 134 "fig. 3A" including the sensed image feature).

Although Gibbons teaches of updating the indicator to reflect the association to allow a user to preview paper stock in the print tray prior to using the paper stock to print (col. 6, lines 49-54) also describes that the status information of the paper and the tray is provided to the printer controller 46 and updated at the media indicator 134), Gibbons does not teach of updating an user interface accessible across a network to reflect the association to allow a user to preview paper stock in the print tray.

Parsons teaches of updating the user interface accessible across a network (col. 6, lines 47-58) to reflect the association to allow a user to preview paper stock in the print tray prior to using the paper stock to print (i.e., 62 in fig. 1B and fig. 10; and col. 6, lines 53-58).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the step of updating in Gibbons for updating the information about the paper and tray to a user interface as taught by Parsons. The suggestion for modifying the step of updating in Gibbons can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth above by Parsons because the modified step of updating would increase the efficiency of the printing system by directly providing the information of the paper and the trays to the user at his

user interface when he/she prepares the print job. Such a modification would allow the user to keep track the current information of the paper and trays during he/she prepares the print jobs.

As to claim 2, Takahashi discloses every feature discussed in claim 1, and Takahashi further teaches of the scanning is performed by a stand-alone scanner (fig. 1 including scanner (i.e., sensor) 134).

4. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibbons and Parsons as applied to claim 1 above, and in combination with Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (page 5, lines 20-22).

As to claim 3, Gibbons and Parsons disclose every feature discussed in claim 1.

However, neither Gibbons nor Parsons teach the document management application is SharpDesk.

Applicant's Admitted Prior Art teaches any of document management applications including SharpDesk that can manage scanned images can be used (page 5, lines 20-22).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the document management application of Gibbons or Parsons to be SharpDesk for managing the document on the display device as taught by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. The suggestion for modifying the document management application of Gibbons or Parsons can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth above by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art because the modified document management application from the printing systems would increase the efficiency and flexibility of the printer for adapting to process the variety of formatted documents. The advantage of such modification of the printing

systems would allow the printer to install with any of the available document management applications in the commercial products.

As to claim 4, Takahashi discloses every feature discussed in claim 1.

However, neither Gibbons nor Parsons teach the document management application is Adobe Acrobat.

Applicant's Admitted Prior Art teaches any of document management applications including Adobe Acrobat that can manage scanned images can be used (page 5, lines 20-22).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the document management application of Gibbons or Parsons to be Adobe Acrobat for managing the document on the display device as taught by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art. The suggestion for modifying the document management application of Gibbons or Parsons can be reasoned by one of ordinary skill in the art as set forth above by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art because the modified document management application from the printing systems would increase the efficiency and flexibility of the printer for adapting to process the variety of formatted documents. The advantage of such modification of the printing systems would allow the printer to install with any of the available document management applications in the commercial products.

Response to Arguments and Amendment

5. Applicant's arguments, see page 4, filed 5/13/04, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1 under 102 rejection have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a **new ground(s) of**

Art Unit: 2624

rejection is made in view of Gibbons et al. (US Patent No. 5,305,020) and Parsons et al. (US Patent No. 5,133,048). This action is made **non-final**.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas Q. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-4857 or E-mail address is Douglas.tran@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

Douglas Q. Tran
Sep. 16, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Tranlong".